

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/743,369		12/22/2003	Thomas Walter Keller JR.	AUS920030889US1	9321	
61043	7590	06/15/2006	EXAMINER		INER	
IBM CORI		ON (MH) , ATTORNEY AT LA	CRIBBS, MA	CRIBBS, MALCOLM D		
P.O. BOX 515				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
LAKEMONT, GA 30552-0515			2115			
				DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/743,369	KELLER ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Malcolm D. Cribbs	2115				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any (	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAISSING STATE IN THE MAILING TH	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a repty be time vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N.  wely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 De	<u>ecember 2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> □	This action is FINAL. 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Applicati	ion Papers						
10)□	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachmen	ut(s) te of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary	(PTO_413)				
2) Notice	the of References Cited (PTO-892) the of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) the No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/07/06</u> .	Paper No(s)/Mail Da					

Art Unit: 2115

5

10

15

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claims 1-20 are presented for examination.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nanja [Publication No. US 2005/0132238] in view of Maitra [US Patent No. 5,623647] in further view of Faucher et al [US Patent No. 5,404,543].

## As per claims 1-6, Nanja teaches the invention comprising:

first measuring the per-thread usage of a device by each thread in a first set of multiple threads [Page 2-3 [0026] "performance monitor collects usage patterns of every application thread running on the system."]; and

storing the measured usage [Page 3 [0034] "gathers or derives instruction counts and memory references [which includes usage of the thread] cycle counts and stores..."].

20

5

10

15

20

Nanja does not teach a method of determining the next set of threads or sending power management commands in conformity with the measured usage. Specifically, Nanja teaches a method of sending power commands based on the current measured usage cycles for power conservation purposes. However, Nanja do not teach a method of retrieving the measured usage for the next thread application to be run. A routineer in the art would have been motivated to look for a teaching for the possible method of further conserving power by retrieving the measured usage of a thread to be run next.

Maitra teaches another method of conserving power using power commands based on stored usage. Maitra teaches a method of sending power commands [adjusting the speed of the processor] based on reading retrieved usage that was stored into memory [determines the computing requirement of this application by referencing the configuration information read into memory] of a thread [application] to be run next [determines the scheduled application to be run by the microprocessor in the next quantum] [Col 8 line 45 – Col 9 line 10]. In summary, Maitra teaches a method of further conserving power by controlling power based on the application to be run next as opposed to adjusting the power based on the current application running.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Nanja and Maitra, which are analogous art, because they both teach a method of sending power commands based on the usage rate of a device. Maitra

Art Unit: 2115

5

10

15

20

covers the deficiency of Nanja by teaching the detail of sending power commands to set the power based on the next process to be run.

Nanja and Maitra do not teach a method of setting a threshold level of total usage for the device in conformity with said retrieved stored measured usage.

Specifically, Nanja and Maitra disclose setting the state of a device based on the stored measured usage. However, Nanja and Maitra fail to detail a method of setting the limit of total usage based on stored measured usage. A routineer in the art would have been motivated to look for a teaching for the possible setting a threshold level in conformity with the retrieved stored usage.

Faucher et al teaches another method of sending power commands based on the measured usage of a device to conserve power. Faucher et al teaches a device controller wherein an usage evaluator further comprises an adaptive threshold circuit for adjusting the threshold based on the measured use of the devices [changing a threshold based on whether the system is operating on AC or DC power [Col 6 lines 48-55]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Nanja and Maitra with Faucher et al, which are analogous art, because they all teach a method of sending power commands based on measured usage to conserve power. Faucher et al covers the deficiency of Nanja and Maitra by teaching

Application/Control Number: 10/743,369

Art Unit: 2115

the detail of setting a threshold value based on usage instead of a constant threshold value.

Page 5

As per claim 2, Maitra teaches the invention of setting a state of said first measuring for said next set of threads in conformity with a result of said retrieving and determining [Col 8 line 53 – Col 9 line 3].

As per claims 3-6, Nanja, Maitra, and Faucher et al teach the claimed invention as stated hereinabove.

10

15

5

As per claims 7-14, it is directed to the system to implement the method of steps as set forth in claims 1-6. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

As per claims 15-20, it is directed to the computer program product to implement the method of steps as set forth in claims 1-6. Therefore, it is rejected for the same basis as set forth hereinabove.

#### Conclusion

20

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Malcolm D. Cribbs whose telephone number is 571-272-5689. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8AM-430PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/743,369 Page 6

Art Unit: 2115

5

10

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Lee can be reached on 571-272-3667. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Malcolm D Cribbs Examiner Art Unit 2115

15 May 31, 2006

CHUNCAO PRIMARY EXAMINER